REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 5 and 8 have been amended. Claims 11-18 have been previously cancelled without prejudice. New claims 19-26 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 19-26 are now presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the final Office Action mailed on March 1, 2005.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-10 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Olarig et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,167,476 ("Olarig").

Applicant respectfully submits that <u>Olarig</u> discloses an AGP device serving as a master device and "[w]hen the *master has completed transferring all the requests it has, the AGP to AGP bridge will process the write commands.* The master will need to get write data into the AGP to AGP bridge so that, *when the core logic requests the data, the master will have the data available.*" (col. 15, lines 11-21; emphasis provided).

Claim 1, as amended, recites, in pertinent part, receiving <u>accelerated graphics port (AGP) transaction requests at a first bus interface from a core logic device</u>, and <u>transmitting the AGP transaction requests to the core logic device</u>. (emphasis provided). <u>Olarig</u> does not teach or reasonably suggest such a feature. For example, the master (or AGP device) in <u>Olarig</u> completes all of the transfer requests it has, and none of them are transmitted to the core logic. In fact, the master does not interact with the core logic until after the completion of all its transfer requests. In addition, any interaction between the master and the core logic must be done via the AGP to AGP bridge. (col. 15, lines 11-

21). Consequently, <u>Olarig</u> does not teach or reasonably suggest receiving <u>accelerated graphics port (AGP) transaction requests at a first bus interface from a core logic device</u>, and <u>transmitting the AGP transaction requests to the core logic device</u>, as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided).

Additionally, although <u>Olarig</u> discloses having a "target and arbiter 248" in figure 4A (fig. 4A, col. 11, line 3), it does not teach or reasonably suggest "<u>arbitrating access</u> to the first bus interface <u>using a request arbiter</u> coupled to the second bus interface" as recited by claim 1 (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 5 and 8 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and 8 and their dependent claims.

New Claims

New claims 19-21 depend from independent claims 1, 5 and 8 and thus include the limitations of their base claim.

New claim 22 contains limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that claims 19-26 are distinguished over the sighted reference.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

The Applicant respectfully petitions for an Extension of Time to respond to the outstanding Final Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: _May 20, 2005_
Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980